REMARKS

Claims 1-8 have been pending.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hao (US Patent no. 5,844,553).

Claims 1, 2, and 7 are amended, claim 8 is cancelled, and, thus the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

No new matter has been added.

35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, rejections

Claim 1 is rejected for allegedly being indefinite. The Applicants disagree. To expedite prosecution, claim 1 language form is amended. Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is requested.

35 USC 102(e) rejection

The independent claims are 1, 2 and 7.

Hao is directed to sharing same action and same result based on the same action between two or more workstations (Abstract, column 5, lines 16-29). In other words, Hao column 5, lines 16-29 discusses multicasting a user action to a plurality of applications. In contrast to Hao, the claimed invention is directed to sharing the same action, but **not** sharing a result based upon the same action, because each object or computer individually executes a process based on its own reaction data that defines information that should be reacted to by an object or computer, namely each object or computer "storing a first set of reactions at a first computer, and a second set of reactions at a second computer, where each reaction in the first set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the first computer and execution information associated with each identified operation, and where each reaction in the second set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the second computer and execution information associated with each identified operation." In contrast to Hao, claim 1 provides:

in response to the performing one or more operations at
the ***third computer, generating a transmission***, sent via a

communication path common to the first, second and third computers, comprising **indicia of the one or more performed operations and information operated on by each of the one or more operations**

...

at the first computer ... **determining whether the ~~received~~ indicia <ins>included in the received transmission</ins> corresponds to at least one of the first set of reactions**, and if it does, **performing an execution using the ~~associated~~ execution information ~~of~~<ins>associated with</ins> the one of the first set of reactions**; and

at the second computer, **determining whether the ~~received~~ indicia <ins>included in the received transmission</ins> corresponds to at least one of the second set of reactions**, and if it does, **performing an execution using the ~~associated~~ execution information ~~of~~<ins>associated with</ins> the one of the second set of reactions** (claim 1).

In other words, the claim language "at the first computer ... **determining whether the ~~received~~ indicia <ins>included in the received transmission</ins> corresponds to at least one of the first set of reactions**, and if it does, **performing an execution using the ~~associated~~ execution information ~~of~~<ins>associated with</ins> the one of the first set of reactions**" and "**determining whether the ~~received~~ indicia <ins>included in the received transmission</ins> corresponds to at least one of the second set of reactions**, and if it does, **performing an execution using the ~~associated~~ execution information ~~of~~<ins>associated with</ins> the one of the second set of reactions**" refers to each computer individually storing first and second sets of reaction data. For example, the present application page 5, lines 4-6 and page 9, line 3 to page 11, line 11 support the claims. A benefit of the claimed invention is providing an enhanced amount of freedom of cooperation between objects or computers (see page 4, lines 1-19 of the specification). So independent claim 1 is allowable, because a prima facie case of anticipation based upon Hao cannot be established by failing to expressly or inherently (by failing to necessarily require) the claimed feature of each first and second computer individually setting "**first set of reactions**" and "**second set of reactions**" and "third computer, generating a transmission ... comprising **indicia of the one or more performed operations and information operated on by each of the one or more operations** ... at the first computer ... **determining whether the ~~received~~ indicia <ins>included in the received transmission</ins> corresponds to at least one of the first set of reactions**, and if it does, **performing an execution using the ~~associated~~ execution information ~~of~~<ins>associated with</ins> the one of the**

6

first set of reactions" and "at second computer, *determining whether the received indicia* <u>*included in the received transmission* </u>*corresponds to at least one of the second set of reactions*, and if it does, *performing an execution using the associated execution information ofassociated with the one of the second set of reactions*." Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Further, in contrast to Hao, independent claims 2 and 7, using claim 2 as an example, provide:

> when original operations are executed, transmitting messages on a communication path, common to a plurality of objects, whereby each message is receivable by the plurality of objects, where the messages have a format shared by the objects, and where *each message indicates the operation type of its corresponding executed operation*; and

> when messages so transmitted to the plurality of objects are detected from the communication path and received, *determining whether to react to each message based on each message's indicated operation type*, and when determined to react to a given message, *reacting by executing a reaction operation that is pre-associated with the message's indicated operation type*, where *each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reaction operations and at least some of the operation types* (claim 2).

In contrast to Hao, the claimed invention is directed to sharing the same action, but *not* sharing a result based upon the same action, because each object or computer individually executes a process based on its own reaction data that defines information that should be reacted to by an object or computer, namely "*each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reaction operations and at least some of the operation types*." In other words, independent claims 2 and 7 are allowable, because a prima facie case of anticipation based upon Hao cannot be established by failing to expressly or inherently (by failing to necessarily require) the claimed executing a reaction operation based upon operation type of an executed operation included in a transmitted message corresponding to the executed operation while "*each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reaction operations and at least some of the operation types*."

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 2 and 7 and allowance of claims 2 and 7 is requested.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being not further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____August 7, 2008_____   By: _____
                                            Mehdi D. Sheikerz
                                            Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501